

REMARKS

The following remarks as the preceding claim amendments are in support of Applicants' Request for Continued Examination.

Claim 2, 3, 6, 7, 13, 14, 17 as 27-28 have been rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by O'Brien 6,587,831. This rejection is respectfully traversed with respect to these claims as now amended herein.

Specifically, these claims as amended variously recite the system and method including system including "an internal server for a managing party and a public web server accessible by one or more managed parties, the internal server and the public web server being connected via a first network, the public web server and managed parties being connected via a second network," and "a common schedule table provided on the public web server, the common schedule table storing the schedule transferred from the internal server via the first network," and "enabling means provided on the public web server for enabling the managed parties to refer to the schedule stored in the common schedule table via the second network," and "the internal server is further configured to reject data addressed to the internal server from the managed parties."

In addition, the remaining claims which depend from the independent claims as amended herein are further restricted by specific recitations in various ways of the system structure and method including "the receiving means further receives

the modification data entered via the modification means by the managed parties,” or “the public web server is further configured to provide each of the managed parties with a page for inquiring the schedule stored in the common schedule table through the Internet” or “enabling means provided on the public web server, the method comprising the enabling means enabling the managed parties to submit the schedule modification data.”

These aspects of the claimed invention provide a public web server including a common schedule table, an enabling means, an input database, and an extracting means. These elements cooperate to absolutely separate communication between the internal server and the public web server from communication between the public web server and the managed parties. Specifically, the modification data from the managed parties is addressed to the public web server, not the internal server, and then is stored in the input database of the public web server. The public web server extracts the modification data from the input database and then transfers it to the internal server. Thus, the public web server blocks data from the managed parties from passing through the public web server to the internal server. The schedule from the internal server is addressed to the public web server and then is stored in the common schedule table of the public web server. Schedules to which the managed parties can refer are stored in the common schedule table of the public web server, not in the internal server. Thus,

the public web server blocks data from the internal server from passing through the public web server to the managed parties. The public web server prevents an online connection between the internal server and the managed parties.

These aspects of the claimed invention are not disclosed or even suggested by O'Brien '831 which fails to disclose such configuration of a public web server. According to O'Brien '831 the client logs onto the host, as described on Column 3, lines 53-54. That is, the host and the client are connected online. Schedule information from the client is addressed to the host. There is no disclosure of an input database and an extracting means of the public web server which block data from the managed parties from passing through the public web server to the internal server in the manner as claimed by Applicants. Further, according to O'Brien '831, schedule information from the host is addressed to the client. In contrast, the common schedule table and the enabling means of the public web server as claimed by Applicants block data from the internal server from passing through the public web server to the managed parties, and this aspect of the claimed invention is not disclosed or even suggested by O'Brien '831.

And, contrary to the Examiner's assertion that Applicants' claimed public web server is equivalent to general functions of an online connection to the Internet (for example, that the common schedule table corresponds to displaying the schedule to the client side machines via an online connection to the Internet), the

public server according to the claimed invention prevents an online connection between the managed parties and the internal server in addition to providing an online service to the managed parties via the second network. Such a feature of a public web server is not disclosed or even suggested in O'Brien '831.

Furthermore, in the claimed invention, the internal server rejects data addressed to the internal server from the managed parties. Such a feature is not disclosed in O'Brien '831. According to the Examiner's analysis of O'Brien '831, the users of the disclosed system cannot directly access schedule information stored on the host server, modifications and updates to the schedule are processed by receiving user commands from the online display menu, and the schedule stored on the host server is not directly accessed by the users, but instead the users have to access the displayed website menu in order to view and update schedule information. However, in contrast to this analysis of O'Brien '831, it is noted that the client and the host are connected online, and that user commands are addressed to the host online. Displayed schedules that the users refer to are transferred from the host online. In contrast, the internal server according to the claimed invention rejects data addressed to the internal server from the managed parties, and data from the managed parties is addressed to the public web server, not the internal server.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that the deficient disclosure of O'Brien 831 fails to establish even *prima facie* basis from which a proper determination of anticipation of the claimed invention can be made. Applicants therefore submit that claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 13, 14, 27 and 28 as amended herein are now patentably distinguishable over the cited art.

The dependent claims 4, 5, 8-11, 15, 16 and 18-21 have been rejected under 35 USC§103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Brien '831; as applied above, further in view of Matsuzaki et al '848 this rejection is respectfully traversed with respect to the dependent claims as amended herein.

These claims are further rejected by the additional recitations variously of the system and method including "the receiving means further receives progress data entered via the progress input means by the managed parties," or "the transfer of the schedule to the common schedule table is automatically activated in response to the progress data being recorded," or "the public web server is connected to the managed parties through the Internet; wherein the progress input means includes a page for entering the progress data; and wherein, in response to a click of a transfer button provided on the page, the progress data entered in the page is transferred to the public web server", or "at the public web server, receiving progress data submitted by one or more of the managed parties at the internal server; receiving the progress data from the public web server; recording

the received progress data in the schedule stored in the schedule table; and transferring the schedule in which the progress data is recorded to the common schedule table, or “comparing the progress data with the schedule; assigning a mark to the progress data in accordance with the comparison result; and displaying the progress by the mark.”

These aspects of the claimed invention facilitate separation of communications between the internal server and the public web server from communications between the public web server and the managed parties. As previously noted in the above Remarks, modification data from the managed parties is addressed to the public web server, not to the internal server and then is stored in the input database of the public web server for extraction from there of modification data for transfer to the internal server.

These aspects of the system and method of the claimed invention are not disclosed or even suggested by the references considered either alone or in the combination proposed by the Examiner. Specifically, the deficiency in the disclosure of O’Brien ‘831 is discussed in the above Remarks.

And, Matsuzaki et al ‘848 is understood to assemble a system and functionality in which all client machines 1000 are uniformly connected for common access to model storage that contains product models, resources for product development activity models, as well as to target storage for storing target

values, schedules, costs, product performance parameters, and the like. Applicants are unable to find in this reference aspects of the claimed invention that separate the various accesses over first and second networks in the manner as now claimed. Thus, combining these cited references in the manner proposed by the Examiner fails to yield or even suggests Applicants' claimed invention. It is therefore respectfully submitted that dependent claims 4, 5, 8-11, 15, 16 and 18-21 as now amended are patentable distinguishable over the cited art.

Continued Examination and reconsideration and allowance of all claims are requested. The fee for Request for Continued Examination is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,
JIYUNJI UCHIDA, et al.

Dated: 5/20/04

By:

A.C. Smith

Albert C. Smith
Registration No. 20,355
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Tel.: (650) 335-7296
Fax: (650) 938-5200